REMARKS

The Final Office Action of February 2, 2010, and the references cited therein have now been carefully studied. Reconsideration and allowance of this application are earnestly solicited.

The present invention is directed to a process for the adhesive connection of a plurality of sheets together to form a book by perforating the sheets along a folded edge, folding the perforated sheets and applying adhesive onto the folded edge. The present invention is also directed to a device for producing the book utilizing a double penetration tool having two sets of cutting teeth 6, 7 as shown, for instance, in FIG. 2. The teeth 6, 7 are used for punching slots 10, 11 respectfully. Two interrupted perforation lines extend a small distance from one another and are staggered longitudinally from each other. The punched spots of the two perforation lines are staggered in view of each other by the length of one perforating tooth in the longitudinal direction relative to each other along the folding edge. This results in no gaps being produced between the punched spots of the staggered two perforation lines. This feature is illustrated in FIG. 3. Applicant is providing Exhibit I illustrating double sheets which are perforated and folded according to the teachings of the present invention. Opening the two folded sheets would show the fact that the punched spots of the two perforation lines are staggered with respect to one another and that there are no gaps being produced between the punched spots of the staggered two perforation lines according to the process of the present invention as well as produced by the device of the present invention.

The Examiner has rejected claims 2, 3, 13, 14, 16 and 18 under 35 USC §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for the reasons stated in paragraph 2 of the Office Action. Applicant has amended each of these claims which address the indefiniteness of some of the claim language. It is believed that these amendments result in all of these claims reciting the subject matter of the present invention in a definite manner. Consequently, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully urged.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4 and 10 under 35 USC §102(a) as being anticipated by the reference to Yew. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As previously indicated, the present invention is directed to a process as well as an apparatus for producing a book-like structure. This structure is produced utilizing a perforating process in which the punched spots of the two perforation lines are staggered in view of each other by the length of one perforating tooth in the longitudinal direction relative to each other, resulting in the absence of gaps between the punched spots of the staggered two perforation lines. A review of Exhibit I would clearly show that this is the case. As shown in FIGS. 3A, 3B and 4, the reference to Yew produces a book having a gap referred to as a tie 83. As stated in paragraph [0042] of the Yew reference, "Tie width is critical to a twisting action and tensile strength of the ties (83). It will affect the extent to the book opening after it is bound. Further, these ties (83) act as a lock to the outer pages when the signature is bound". This does indicate that the presence of the ties is important. This is in contradistinction to the present invention in which no "gaps" are provided regardless of their width. There are no staggered flaps in the present invention which are separated from each other by a tie 83 and which protrude hinges from the signature 8 of the Yew reference. The staggered perforation line of the present invention leads to a continuous outer line without any gaps as is shown in Exhibit I. Claim 1 has been amended to specifically indicate that the process of the present invention would result in the absence of gaps between the punched spots of the staggered two perforation lines.

Furthermore, claim 1 has been amended to specifically indicate the inclusion of building double sheets, forming a front and rear sided sheet. The reference to Yew discloses the assembly of multi-layered signatures as stated in paragraph [0001]. A multi-layered signature is built by assembling several double sheets, i.e. four double sheets as shown in FIG. 4 of the Yew reference and described in paragraph [0029]. This multi-layered signature is perforated with a cutter and subsequently folded. The resulting signature as illustrated in FIGS. 3A-3C and FIG. 4, shows, as previously indicated, a plurality of flaps which are protruding in a fan-shaped manner from the folding edge. FIGS. 5A and 5B also show this feature. As discussed in paragraph [0045], the reference to Yew discloses that the breaking into flap leaves an adjacent notch in the spine exposes each layer inside the multi-layered signature. The present invention teaches a method of assembling perforated and folded double sheets one after the other in contradistinction to the Yew reference which discloses a method of assembling several double sheets to a signature, perforating and folding this multi-layered signature and assembling several

multi-layered signatures to a book. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the method of assembly shown in the Yew reference is different than the method described in the present invention and recited in the claims.

According to the present invention, the punched spots are staggered by the length of one perforating tooth in the longitudinal direction relative to each other along the folded edge. Assembling several perforated and folded double sheets one after another results in recesses being spaced from one another between two adjacent double sheets as shown in Exhibit I. The adhesive applied on the edge of the double sheet is able to penetrate in these recesses and will adhere one sheet of the double sheet with the adjacent sheet of a neighboring double sheet. Consequently, a very strong binding strength is created. This is in contradistinction to the Yew reference which discloses multi-layered signatures with bunches of flaps protruding from the signature. The lateral surfaces of the single flaps of one bunch cannot be applied with adhesive because they are lying against each other. Therefore, the binding strength of the book produced by the Yew reference is lower than that produced by the present invention since single double sheets are not connected between each other. Furthermore, using the binding technique of the Yew reference, the signatures are anchored in the adhesive layer between the block of signatures and the cover as described in paragraph [0022].

It is important to note that utilizing the binding method of the present invention, each double sheet is adhered to the adjacent one by adhesive located in the recesses. The present invention therefore produces a stronger binding strength and is capable of withstanding heavier abuses, utilizes a continuous laminar adhering and no gaps are provided between the staggered spots in the longitudinal direction. Consequently, it is believed that the present invention as recited in claims 1-4 and 10 are not anticipated by the Yew reference. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully urged.

The Examiner has rejected the remaining claims of the present invention under 35 USC§103(a) as being unpatentable over Yew itself, or the combination of the Yew and various references including the patents to Michalik, Dalfiume and the reference to Kaing. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

All of the remaining claims rejected under 35 USC §103 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1. Therefore, since it is believed that claim 1, as amended, does recite the present invention in a patentable manner, these additional claims would also define the invention in a patentable manner. Consequently, reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections as well as the allowance of this application are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 6/1/2010

Mitchell B. Wasson
Reg. No. 27,408

HOFFMAN, WASSON & GITLER, PC
2461 South Clark Street, Suite 522
Arlington, VA 22202
703.415.0100
Customer No. 20741

Attorney's Docket: A-9957.AMA/cat